1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	,	
11	Stephanie Truong, individually and on behalf of all those similarly situated,	Case No. C-06-7640 SBA
12	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
13	v.	Honorable Sandra Brown Armstrong
14	LG-Philips LCD Co. Ltd., LG Philips LCD	· ·
15	America, Inc.; Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.; Sharp Corporation; Sharp Electronics	
16	Corporation; Toshiba Corporation Toshiba Matsushita Display Technology Co., Ltd.;	
17	Hitachi Ltd.; Hitachi Displays, Ltd.; Hitachi America Ltd.; Hitachi Electronic	
18	Devices (USA), Inc.; Sanyo Epson Imaging Devices Corporation; NEC Corporation;	
19	NEC LCD Technologies, Ltd.; NEC Electronics America, Inc.; IDT	
20	International Ltd.; AU Optronics; International Display Technology Co.,	
21	Ltd.; International Display Technology USA Inc.; AU Optronics Corporation	
22	America; Chi Mei Optoelectronics; Chi Mei Optoelectronics USA, Inc.; Chunghwa	
23	Picture Tubes Ltd.; Hannstar Display Corporation,	
24	Defendants.	
25		
26 27		
27		

CaSe.Se0806/40/7646450I-SI Dioourment1918 Fffeldd001/08/02/007 Palgagleof of 3

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

1-SF/7453501.1

STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

WHEREAS plaintiff filed a complaint in the above-captioned case on or about December 12, 2006;

WHEREAS plaintiff alleges antitrust violations by manufacturers of Liquid Crystal Display ("LCD") products;

WHEREAS more than fifteen complaints have been filed to date in federal district courts throughout the United States by plaintiffs purporting to bringing class actions on behalf of indirect purchasers alleging antitrust violations by manufacturers of LCD products (collectively, "the LCD Cases");

WHEREAS there is a motion pending before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to transfer the LCD Cases to the Northern District of California for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407;

WHEREAS plaintiff anticipates the possibility of Consolidated Amended Complaints in the LCD Cases;

WHEREAS plaintiff and Hitachi America, Ltd. ("HAL") and Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc. ("HED-US") have agreed that an orderly schedule for any response to the pleadings in the LCD Cases would be more efficient for the parties and for the Court;

WHEREAS plaintiff agrees that the deadline for HAL and HED-US to respond to the Complaint shall be extended until the earlier of the following two dates: (1) forty-five days after the filing of a Consolidated Amended Complaint in the LCD Cases; or (2) forty-five days after plaintiff provided written notice to HAL and HED-US that plaintiff does not intend to file a Consolidated Amended Complaint, provided that such notice may be given only after the initial case management conference in the MDL transferee court in this case;

WHEREAS plaintiff further agrees that this extension is available, without further stipulation with counsel for plaintiff, to all named defendants who notify plaintiff in writing of their intention to join this extension;

WHEREAS this Stipulation does not constitute a waiver by HAL and HED-US or any defendant of any defense, including but not limited to the defenses of lack of personal or subject

25

26

27

1-SF/7453501.1

matter jurisdiction, insufficiency of process, insufficiency of service of process, or improper 1 2 venue. 3 PLAINTIFF AND DEFENDANTS HAL AND HED-US, BY AND THROUGH THEIR 4 RESPECTIVE COUNSEL OF RECORD, HEREBY STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS: 5 1. The deadline for the HAL and HED-US to respond to the Complaint shall be 6 extended until the earlier of the following two dates (1) forty-five days after the filing of a 7 Consolidated Amended Complaint in the LCD Cases; or (2) forty-five days after the plaintiff 8 provides written notice that he does not intend to file a Consolidated Amended Complaint, 9 provided that such notice may be given only after the initial case management conference in the 10 MDL transferee court in this case. 2. 11 This extension is available, without further stipulation with counsel for plaintiff or 12 further order of the Court, to all named defendants who notify plaintiff in writing of their 13 intention to join this extension. 14 IT IS SO STIPULATED. 15 Dated: 16 Signature: 17 Michael P. Lehmann Kent M. Roger 18 Thomas P. Dove William J. Taylor Christopher L. Lebsock Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP 19 Jon T. King One Market, Spear Street Tower Furth Lehmann & Grant LLP San Francisco, CA 94105-1126 20 225 Bush Street, 15th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104-4249 Counsel for Defendants 21 Hitachi America, Ltd. and Hitachi Electronic Francis O. Scarpulla Devices (USA), Inc. 2.2. Craig C. Corbitt Zelle Hofmann Voelbel Mason & Gette LLP 23 44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400 San Francisco, CA 94104 24 Counsel for Plaintiff Stephanie Truong 25 SO ORDERED: 26 27

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO